



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/528,118

02/03/2006

Norbert Holl

2732-167

8956

6449

7590

03/03/2011

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.

1425 K STREET, N.W.

SUITE 800

WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BITAR, NANCY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/03/2011

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/528,118	HOLL, NORBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NANCY BITAR	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 March 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

In view of the appeal brief filed on 11/22/2011, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing
Below

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject

Art Unit: 2624

matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laskowski et al (US 6,101,266) in view of Ishida et al (US 4,352,988).

As to claim 1, Laskowski et al teaches in figure 1 a method for checking a document of value, with which the document of value for soiling and spots, comprising the steps of: illuminating with an illuminating system at least in a partial area, (each spot sensing assembly includes four emitters 32 each of the emitters produces radiation at different wavelengths, figure 1) and capturing with a detector system at one or more measuring places (2) (entry end 14 to an exit end 16, figure 1, column 5, lines 54-66) the intensity of the light transmitted through the partial area of the document of value and the intensity of the light reflected (a control circuit 24 produces sensed values that correspond to the detected radiation), or remitted by the partial area of the document of value wherein for each measuring place the intensities of the transmitted and the reflected light are summed up to obtain a sum intensity (the reflectance detector 20 is in operative connection with, and outputs first signals and a second signal, column 6, lines 1-12 and abstract), and the sum intensity value for each measuring place is each compared to a predetermined standard value (the control circuit calculates a level of correlation between the stored values and the sensed values, column 5, lines 54-column 6, lines 1-12, see figure 4; by comparing the correlated values to threshold values, the control circuit is operative to determine the type of note and other conditions such as if a note is worn, soiled, or a double note). While Laskowski et al meets a number of the limitations of the claimed invention, as pointed out more fully above, Laskowski et al fails to specifically teach the reflected light are summed up to obtain a sum intensity value and the sum intensity value of each measuring place is each

Art Unit: 2624

compared to a predetermined standard value. Specifically, Ishida teaches a first detecting system for detecting light transmitted through a sheet and a second detecting system for detecting light reflected by the front surface of the sheet, a third detecting system for detecting light reflected by the rear surface of the sheet. The light doses sensed by these detecting systems are integrated by respective integrators for a predetermined period of time, and the outputs obtained from the integrators are coupled to an adder and added together therein. The sum output of the adder and a reference signal generator are compared with each other in a comparator (see abstract). While Ishida teaches the sum of light reflected by the front surface of a sheet and light transmitted there through and the sum of light reflected by the rear surface of the sheet and light transmitted there through are separately obtained and compared with respective reference signals (figures 3 and 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Intensity adder of Ishida in Laskowski control circuit for the purpose of obtaining accurate measurements to determine the sheet is adequate for re-use or not (column 4, lines 29-49). Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention by applicant.

As to claim 2, Laskowski et al teaches the method according to claim 1, characterized in that the intensity values captured from the measuring place or the individual measuring places are corrected before the summation for compensating locally differing measuring conditions (column 17, lines 17-32).

As to claim 3, Laskowski et al teaches the method according to claim 2, characterized in that the correction is effected for compensating local intensity fluctuations in illumination given when measuring (column 17, lines 17-32).

As to claim 4, Laskowski et al teaches the method according to claim 2, characterized in that the correction is effected for compensating locally differing detector specifications (figure 2, 22).

As to claim 5, Laskowski et al teaches the method according to claim 4, characterized in that each captured intensity value before the summation is reduced by a dark current measuring value determined for the respective measuring place (note that correlation values calculated may be tailored to note properties and area of interest, column 10, lines 1-3).

As to claim 6, Laskowski et al teaches a method according to claim 5, characterized in that for determining the dark current measuring values intensity measuring are effected with switched-off illumination (all the blue emitters go off and all the green emitters in each of the spot sensing assemblies come on, column 7, lines 6-21).

As to claim 7, Laskowski et al teaches a method according to claim 1, characterized in that each captured intensity value, is multiplied with a correction factor determined for the measuring place of the respective intensity value (These overall values are then multiplied together to calculate a final value indicative of correlation of the stored value set and the test note, column 9, lines 41-48)

As to claim 8, Laskowski et al teaches a method according to claim 7, characterized in that the correction factors are obtained on the basis of the intensity values, which are determined by means of intensity measuring in reference documents (column 23, lines 53 to column 24, lines 1-9).

As to claim 9, Laskowski et al teaches a method according to claim 1, characterized in that the document of value in a transportation direction is guided past an illumination system

Art Unit: 2624

and a detector system positioned to this, and with the illumination system at least on one side of the document of value an illumination profile is produced, which extends transverse to the transportation direction (see figure 2-3, note that FIG. 14 is a graphical representation of reflectance signals obtained from transversely disposed spot sensing assemblies for a skewed note, which signals are used by the control circuit to determine an angle of skew; see also Ishida et al figure 3).

As to claim 10, Laskowski et al teaches a method according to claim 9, characterized in that with a plurality of detector elements, which are positioned in a row at right angles to the transportation direction(see figure 9) , the intensity values along a plurality of measuring tracks extending in parallel to the transportation direction are captured (note that the control circuit 24 has the advantage that each of the digital signal processors operates in parallel on the master templates stored in its associated memory).

The limitation of claims 11-13 has been addressed above see Laskowski figure 2 and 3

Claims 13-22 differ from claim 1-12 only in that claims 1-12 are method claims whereas, claims system claims. Thus, claims 13-22 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-12 above.

As to claim 23, Laskowski et al teaches the method of claim 7 wherein each said captures intensity value is reduced by a dark current measuring value (all the blue emitters go off and all the green emitters in each of the spot sensing assemblies come on, column 7, lines 6-21)

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANCY BITAR whose telephone number is (571)270-1041. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (7:30a.m. to 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vikkram Bali can be reached on 571-272-7415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nancy Bitar/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/VIKKRAM BALI/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624